

**REMARKS**

Applicants submit the following remarks in reply to the Final Office Action mailed on October 18, 2006. Claims 1-7, 12-19, and 23-26 are hereby amended. Claims 1-27 remain pending in the present application.

On pages 1-2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-11, apparently under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e),<sup>1</sup> as being anticipated by Jonathan B. Rosenberg, How Debuggers Work, September 27, 1996, Wiley Computer Publishing ("Rosenberg"), and rejects claims 12-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claim 1, as amended, defines a method comprising, *inter alia*, the steps of "debugging computer program code," the program code "including at least one type of breakpoint... including a conditional instruction," and "activating or deactivating a plurality of breakpoints of the at least one type by a single action that causes a condition referred to in the conditional instruction to be fulfilled." Rosenberg does not disclose at least these features.

Rosenberg discloses a debugger software program that allows users to select individual breakpoints. Users may view a set of breakpoints and may individually modify each breakpoint. See Rosenberg, pp. 27-28. Breakpoints are set in a debugger program that places the breakpoints into an executable in a source view by specifying a source line in the source view. See id., pp. 22-25, 110-111. Further, the debugger

---

<sup>1</sup> The reference to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) appears to be in error. Applicants believe the Examiner intended to reject claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), and has treated the rejection accordingly.

system disclosed by Rosenberg requires that each user-created breakpoint “be represented and maintained uniquely.” See id., pp. 107-108.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Rosenberg system differs from claim 1 because Rosenberg fails to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, “activating or deactivating a plurality of breakpoints of at least one type by a single action that causes a condition referred to in the conditional instruction to be fulfilled,” as required by claim 1. While Rosenberg discloses that breakpoints may be conditional, Rosenberg does not disclose a “single action” that causes a condition referred to in a “conditional instruction” included in a plurality of breakpoints to be fulfilled. Furthermore, Rosenberg does not disclose activating or deactivating a “plurality of breakpoints” based on such a “single action.”

Rosenberg, only teaches setting breakpoints individually. For example, page 110 of Rosenberg states, “the user specifies that a source line in the editor or source view should have a breakpoint set on it.” Rosenberg further states that each user-created breakpoint “be represented and maintained uniquely.” Id. at 108. As such, Rosenberg teaches away from activating or deactivating a plurality of breakpoints of at least one type by a single action.

On page 3 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner contends that the section on page 102 of Rosenberg labeled “Process Creating/Deletion Events” discloses the claimed feature of activating or deactivating a plurality of breakpoints of at least one type by a single action. However, this portion of Rosenberg entirely fails to discuss activating or deactivating breakpoints. Rather, it merely states that “some debuggers are designed to handle debugging multiple processes,” and further describes that a debugger can track multiple processes at once by “attaching” certain processes after

other processes are already running. There is no mention or teaching of multiple breakpoints. This portion of Rosenberg, thus, fails to teach or suggest activating or deactivating a plurality of breakpoints of at least one type by a *single* action, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, Rosenberg fails to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1. Therefore, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons set forth with regard to claim 1.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 12-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Independent claims 12 and 23, although different in scope from claim 1 include limitations similar to that recited in claim 1, and are distinguishable from the cited art for reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 12 and 23 be withdrawn and the claims allowed. Claims 13-22 depend from claim 12 and claims 24-27 depend from claim 23, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons set forth in connection with claims 12 and 23.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the pending claims are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants, therefore, request the Examiner's reconsideration of the application, and the timely allowance of all of the pending claims.

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing pending claims 1-27 in condition for allowance.

Applicants submit that the proposed amendments of claims 1-7, 12-19, and 23-26 do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Applicants respectfully point out that the Final Office Action by the Examiner presented some new arguments as to the application of the art against Applicants' invention. It is respectfully submitted that the entering of the Amendment would allow the Applicants to reply to the final rejections and place the application in condition for allowance.

Finally, Applicants submit that the entry of the amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

The Final Office Action contains characterizations of the claims and the related art with which Applicants do not necessarily agree. Unless expressly noted otherwise, Applicants decline to subscribe to any statement or characterization in the final Office Action.

If a telephone interview will expedite issuance of this application, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' representative, whose name and registration number appear below, to discuss any remaining issues.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Attorney Docket No. 07781.0090-00  
SAP Reference No. 2002P00089US

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: December 20, 2006

By: Bradley Edelman  
Bradley Edelman  
Reg. No. 57,648